



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/311,617	05/13/1999	BRENT TOWNSHEND	99.294	1470

20306 7590 06/07/2002

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 3200
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

DORVIL, RICHEMOND

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/311,617

Applicant(s)

TOWNSHEND, BRENT

Examiner

Richemond Dorvil

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2654

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Drawings

INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES

1. **Correction of Informalities -- 37 CFR 1.85**

New corrected drawings must be filed with the changes incorporated therein. Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and centered within the top margin. If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings **MUST** be filed within the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period set for reply in the "Notice of Allowability." Extensions of time may NOT be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability. The drawings should be filed as a separate paper with a transmittal letter addressed to the Official Draftsperson.

2. **Corrections other than Informalities Noted by Draftsperson on form PTO-948.**

All changes to the drawings, other than informalities noted by the Draftsperson, **MUST** be made in the same manner as above except that, normally, a highlighted (preferably red ink) sketch of the changes to be incorporated into the new drawings **MUST** be approved by the examiner before the application will be allowed. No changes will be permitted to be made, other than correction of informalities, unless the examiner has approved the proposed changes.

Timing of Corrections

Applicant is required to submit acceptable corrected drawings within the time period set in the Office action. See 37 CFR 1.185(a). Failure to take corrective action within the set (or extended) period will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application.

Art Unit: 2654

2. The proposed drawing correction filed on 1.30.02 has been disapproved because it is not in the form of a pen-and-ink sketch showing changes in red ink or with the changes otherwise highlighted. See MPEP § 608.02(v).

3. New formal drawings are required in this application because the formal drawings provided with the response filed on Jan. 30, 2002, contain handwritten information which is not acceptable. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-8, 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturner et al., Patent No. 5,303,327.

6. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sturner et al., Patent No. 5,303,327.

Art Unit: 2654

As per claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 18,17, Sturner et al. disclose a test system/method comprising;

A first set of task that require a subject to provide one or more spoken responses, (see abstract, lines 2-3);

A speech recognition system to receive the spoken response and provide a estimate, (see col. 3, line 64 to col. 4, line 12, col. 6, line 64);

A scoring device to convert the estimate into a score, (see col. 5, lines 4-21);

A computation device for providing a subject score based on a combination of item scores using a scoring computation model that depends upon an expected item-dependent operating characteristic of the speech recognition system, (see abstract, lines 6-13).

Sturner fail to explicitly teach that the subject score accounts for an ability of the speech recognition system to accurately recognize the spoken response. However, the system of Sturner et al. take into accounts noise parameters that may affect the subject's input, (see Fig. 2 and Fig 3A). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take into account the ability of the speech recognition system, replacing the human operator, to accurately recognize speech because it is well known in the art that recognition errors and input noise have negative effect on the evaluation of a subject's response.

As per claim 2, Sturner et al. disclose a system wherein the scoring computation is based on Item Response Theory, (see col. 5, lines 36-46).

As per claim 3, Sturner et al. disclose a system wherein the speech recognition system , the scoring device and the computation device comprise software modules running on a general purpose computer, (see Fig. 1).

Art Unit: 2654

As per claim 4, Sturner et al. disclose a system wherein the scoring computation model is constructed from a plurality of responses provided by a number of native and non-native speakers, the plurality of responses being prompted by a second set of tasks items, (see col. 5, lines 36-39).

As per claim 5, Sturner et al. disclose a system wherein the estimate provided by the speech recognition comprises an estimate of the linguistic content of the spoken response, (see col. 5, lines 48-66).

As per claim 6, Sturner et al. disclose a system wherein at least one task is an item selected from a group consisting of a prompt to read a sentence aloud ..., (see col. 6, lines 16-37).

As per claims 9-13, and 15, Sturner et al. disclose all the claims limitations, (see Abstract).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 10-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Applicant's arguments filed 01.30.02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's response to the rejection of claims 1-17 argue that Sturner "fails to show a scoring computation that accounts for inaccuracies of the speech recognition system itself." The examiner cannot concur this feature is not recited in claim 7. Fig. 3A of Sturner takes into

account noise parameters that may affect scoring and recognition when the operator is replaced by a ASR system.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richemond Dorvil whose telephone number is (703) 305-9645. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 9:30AM to 8:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (703) 308-5576. The fax phone numbers


Application/Control Number: 09/311,617

Page 7

Art Unit: 2654

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 3059508 for regular communications and (703) 308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Richemond Dorvil
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2654

RD
June 2, 2002